



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

cl
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,895	11/03/2003	Niall Stephen Doherty	PC23213A	4374
28880	7590	10/12/2006	EXAMINER	
WARNER-LAMBERT COMPANY 2800 PLYMOUTH RD ANN ARBOR, MI 48105			PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1616		

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,895	DOHERTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alton N. Pryor	1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/26/04</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MacKenzie et al (USPN 5912244; 6/15/99). MacKenzie teaches a pharmaceutical composition for treating several conditions including alopecia comprising a compound of formula I where R, R1, R2 = CH₃; X = O; R₃ = 2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl; and R₄ = 3-hydroxyphenyl, i.e. 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran. See column 14 Example 5. The compound 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran is taught in instant claims. MacKenzie teaches the composition as a lotion for topical application. The composition contains in addition to 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. See column 10 line 29 – column 11 line 2, claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1616

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacKenzie as applied to claims 15-17 above. See 102(b) rejection above. MacKenzie recites all limitations present in claims 1-14 except for a method of specifically administering 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran to a person in order to treat alopecia. MacKenzie teaches a method of administering 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran to a person in order to treat numerous conditions including alopecia. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to administer 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran to a person in order to treat alopecia. One would have been motivated to do this since MacKenzie suggests a method of treating alopecia using 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29

Art Unit: 1616

USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 20050182065 or 11/053,008. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because USAN '008 teaches a topical pharmaceutical composition comprising the compound 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran plus a carrier. The article of manufacture comprises a pharmaceutical formulation containing 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran. USAN '008 teaches that the compound is used topically to treat alopecia. Since instant application makes claim to composition and method for treating alopecia comprising 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran, USAN '008 makes instant claims obvious. USAN '008 differs only in scope from instant application. However, an artisan would be directed to using 3,4-dihydro-4-(2,3-dihydro-2-methyl-3-

Art Unit: 1616

oxopyridazin-6-yl)oxy-3-hydroxy-6-(3-hydroxyphenyl)sulphonyl-2,2,3-trimethyl-2H-benzo[b]pyran in instant application which is the species employed in USAN '008.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 571-272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Alton N. Pryor

Application/Control Number: 10/699,895

Page 6

Art Unit: 1616

Primary Examiner

AU 1616